



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/633,139 08/04/00 NAKAZAWA

T 000977

023850 MM91/0411
ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,
MCLELAND & NAUGHTON, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW, SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON DC 20006

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834
DATE MAILED:

04/11/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/633,139

Applicant(s)
Ojima et al.

Examiner
Thanh Lam

Group Art Unit
2834



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on Aug 4, 2000 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 5

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior art (fig. 1-2 of the application) in view of Evans et al.

Prior art (fig. 1 and 2) disclose all the aspect of the claimed invention except for the use of a reluctance motor having magnetic salient poles and a permanent magnet disposed respectively in the salient

Art Unit: 2834

Evans et al. disclose a reluctance motor having magnetic salient poles (16) and a permanent magnet (28) disposed respectively in the salient poles.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the motor structure as taught by prior art and replace the reluctance rotor of Evans et al. as disclosed above to take place of the rotor of prior art that would provide a reluctance rotor with improvement of a power output.

5. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art in view of Evans et al. As applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Trago et al.

Prior art and Evans et al. disclose essentially claimed invention except for the shield member comprising a mold body of a synthetic resin and the stator being embedded in the resin.

Trago et al. disclose a mold body of a synthetic resin and the stator being embedded in the resin for improving corrosion resistance of the stator.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the shield member of prior art and replace the mold resin as taught by Trago et al. for preventing corrosive and improving the corrosion resistance of the stator.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art in view of Evans as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Naito et al.

Prior art and Evans et al. disclose all the aspect of the claimed invention except for the rotor is made of permalloy.

Art Unit: 2834

Naito et al. disclose permalloy material (col. 14, line 4-5) for making a rotor in order to prevent corrosion of the rotor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the rotor as taught by Prior art and apply the use of permalloy as disclosed by Naito et al. into the rotor that would provide the rotor with a high corrosion resistance.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Lam whose telephone number is (703) 308-7626. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3431.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0656.



Thanh Lam

April 6, 2001



ELVIN ENAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
142824
4/9/2001